

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are currently pending. Claims 1-17 are rejected. Claims 1, 9, and 17 have been amended.

The drawing have been objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5). Assignee has amended the specification, and in view of the amendments to the specification, submit that the drawings are now in compliance.

Claim 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Stohs. Stohs is directed to "Recovery of Stored Data from Multilated Tape Data Blocks." Stohs, Title. In Stohs, "Upon receiving a request for the block of data, the controller causes a tape drive (108) to read the block from the tape. The controller stores the read data in a buffer memory (111) that is at least the size of the data block." Id., Abstract.

Assignee has amended claim 1 to recite, among other limitations, "storing the sequential portion, in a second memory comprising less than the amount of memory occupied by the plurality of sequential data words in the first memory". Claims 9 is amended to recite, among other limitations, "a local buffer for storing the sequential portion, comprising less than the amount of memory occupied by the plurality of sequential data words in the first memory."

It is respectfully submitted that Stohs does not teach or fairly suggest "storing the sequential portion, in a second memory" or "a local buffer", "comprising less than the amount of memory occupied by the plurality of sequential data words in the first memory." Emphasis Added. In contrast, Stohs teaches that "Upon receiving a request for the block of data, the controller causes a tape drive (108) to read the block from the tape. The controller stores the read data in a buffer memory (111) that is at least the size of the data block." Id., Abstract (Emphasis Added).

Accordingly, Examiner is requested to withdraw the rejection to claims 1 and 9, as well as to dependent claims 2-8, and 10-16.

Similarly, claim 17, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious from Stohs in view of Katsavounidis, is amended to include, among other limitations, "a local buffer for storing the sequential portion, comprising less than the amount of memory occupied by the plurality of sequential data words in the first memory". As described above, Stohs does not teach or fairly suggest the foregoing limitation. Assignee has reviewed Katsavounidis and respectfully submits that Katsavounidis does not teach the foregoing limitation. Accordingly, Examiner is requested to withdraw the rejection to claim 17.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, each of the pending claims are allowable, making the application in a condition for allowance. Examiner is requested to pass this case to issuance. To the extent that any monies are required for the actions requested herein in addition to any funds transmitted herewith, Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the same to account no. 13-0017.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED



Mirut Dalal
Reg. No. 44,052
ATTORNEY FOR ASSIGNEE

January 17, 2006

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison – Suite 3400
Chicago, IL 60661

Voice (312) 775-8000
FAX (312) 775-8100